



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/468,377	12/20/1999	YURIJ ANDRIJ BARANSKY	Y0999-558	3573
7590	04/04/2006		EXAMINER	
ANNE V. DOUGHERTY, ESQ. 3173 Cedar Road Yorktown Heights, NY 10598			NALVEN, ANDREW L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2134	

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/468,377	BARANSKY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrew L. Nalven	2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2005.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 December 1999 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are not persuasive.

3. With regards to claims 9, 14, and 17, Applicant has asserted on page 15 that the present amendment obviates the previous 35 USC 112 rejections based upon indefiniteness. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The prior rejections noted that essential elements of the claims were missing. Examiner noted that the step of "transmitting g^b to said client machine" was missing because the client would need to receive this value in order calculate the value of $g^{(a^*b)}$. Applicant has amended to overcome this essential elements rejection. However, the amendment creates further indefiniteness. In the cited claims, the client is in possession of an unencrypted version of g^b in step (d). Because the client knows the value of g , this effectively means that the client knows the value of b . However, the claims as currently presented require that the user not know the value of b . If the client knows the value of b then the user would have access to this value. As a result, the cited claims are indefinite.

4. Further, regarding claims 9, 14, and 17, Applicant has not responded to Examiner's 35 USC 112 rejection which noted that the cited claims contain the following

limitation as part of step e, "wherein an encryption key Kab... uses g^{ab}." Examiner is unclear as to how an encryption key uses another encryption key.

5. With regards to claims 1, 5, and 9, Applicant has responded to the 35 USC 112 rejections by asserting that the user only needs the second key for decrypting the encrypted version of the data. This assertion does not address the point upon which the indefiniteness rejection was based. Examiner rejected the cited claims under 35 USC 112 second paragraph because step b provides that the second key is encrypted by a one-time password and said first key. The first key is required to be known only by the content provider (see claim 1 step (a)). Claim 1 then requires that the user decrypts the encrypted second key using only the one-time password, but does not require the use of the first key. It is unclear to the examiner how the encrypted second key may be decrypted by using only the one time password and not also using the first key. It is also unclear to the Examiner how the decryption of the second key would take place at the client without revealing the first key to the client.

6. Applicant has argued on page 19 that the Thomlinson reference fails to teach a content provider by asserting that Thomlinson teaches a different security arrangement. Examiner contends the claimed limitations only show the steps involved between a content provider and a user in establishing encryption and authentication processes. The service provider defined by the present invention does not participate in the claimed processes. The Thomlinson reference also teaches only two entities (user and provider) involved with establishing encryption and authentication processes. Thus, Examiner contends that the security arrangement of Thomlinson is the same as the

arrangement of the present invention. Applicant's arguments are directed towards limitations provided in the preamble of the claim. The recitations regarding the internet service provider have not been given patentable weight because the recitations occur in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

7. Applicant has argued on page 20 that the Thomlinson reference fails to teach the generating of a first key, the encrypting of a second key using the first key and an encryption algorithm, decrypting the second key using the first key when the user desires access to data. Applicant asserts that Thomlinson fails to teach these limitations because the claims require that the first key (Thomlinson's master key) only be known to the content provider and Applicant asserts that Thomlinson's master key (first key) is known to both entities. Examiner notes that the claims are indefinite as to this point (see above). Further, Examiner continues to maintain that Thomlinson teaches the generating of a first key (Thomlinson, column 9 lines 20-22, master key), the encrypting of a second key using the first key and an encryption algorithm (Thomlinson, column 9 lines 20-22, item key encrypted by master key), decrypting the second key using the first key when the user desires access to data (Thomlinson, column 10 lines 5-13, decrypt item key using master key).

8. Applicant further argues on page 20 that Thomlinson fails to teach the first key (cited as Thomlinson's master key). Applicant asserts that Thomlinson's master key is encrypted by a code that is derived from user authentication and asserts that because of this Thomlinson does not teach the claimed first key. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The claims as currently presented do not preclude the claimed first key from being encrypted by a code that is derived from a user authentication. Further, the claims are presented in a comprising form and thus the claims are open ended. As a result, the fact that the Thomlinson reference teaches above and beyond what is claimed does not provide a basis for concluding that the Thomlinson reference, in combination with the other cited references, fails to render the claims unpatentable. Thus, Examiner maintains that Thomlinson does teach the claimed first key.

9. Applicant further argues on page 20 that Thomlinson fails to teach the second key (cited as Thomlinson's item key). Applicant asserts that Thomlinson's item key is not an encryption or decryption key, but is instead an item identifier. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Thomlinson states, "the item key is then used to decrypt the actual data item" (Thomlinson, column 10 lines 15-16). Thus, the item key is an encryption/decryption key.

10. Applicant further argues on page 21 that the Thomlinson reference fails to teach "storing of an encrypted second key on the client machine." Examiner respectfully disagrees. Thomlinson does teach storing of an encrypted second key on the client machine (Thomlinson, column 9 line 63 – column 10 line 4). Applicant has asserted that Thomlinson teaches returns a package (that includes encrypted keys and data) to

the calling application and this shows storing the key at the encryption provider location. This is an incorrect interpretation of Thomlinson. The calling application is resident on the client machine. Thus, returning the package to the calling application for storage is storing the encrypted second key on the client machine (see Figure 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
12. Claims 1, 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
13. With regards to claims 1, 5, 12-13, 15-16, the cited claims provide the step of "decrypting said encrypted second key using said one-time password" (see step e). Step b defines the second key as being encrypted by a one-time password and said first key. It is unclear to the examiner how the encrypted second key may be decrypted by using only the one time password and not also using the first key. It is also unclear to the Examiner how the decryption of the second key would take place at the client without revealing the first key to the client.
14. With regards to claims 9, 14, and 17, the cited claims contain the following limitation as part of step e, "wherein an encryption key Kab... uses g^{ab}." Examiner is unclear as to how an encryption key uses another encryption key. Further, the cited

claims state only the content provider knows the value of b (see element a). The cited claims later state that the client decrypts the encrypted g^b . Since the client is in possession of the value of g, it is unclear to the examiner how the client would not know of the value of b as well. A client in possession of the value of g and g^b would be able to calculate the value of b.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claims 1, 3-4, 7-8, 12, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomlinson et al US Patent No. 6,389,535 in view of Aziz US Patent No. 5,604,803. Thomlinson teaches a system for cryptographic protection of core data secrets. Aziz teaches a method for secure remote authentication in a public network.

17. With regards to claims 1, 12, and 15, Thomlinson teaches the generating of a first key (Thomlinson, column 9 lines 20-22, master key), the encrypting of a second key using the first key and an encryption algorithm (Thomlinson, column 9 lines 20-22, item key encrypted by master key), decrypting the second key using the first key when the user desires access to data (Thomlinson, column 10 lines 5-13, decrypt item key using master key), the storing of an encrypted second key on the client machine (Thomlinson,

column 9 line 63 – column 10 line 4), and accessing the data using the second key (Thomlinson, column 10 lines 15-16). Thomlinson lacks a reference to the use of a one-time password. Aziz teaches the use of a one-time password (Aziz, column 6 lines 61-64). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Aziz's method of using one-time passwords with Thomlinson's access control system because it offers the advantage of reducing the likelihood of an unauthorized user gaining access to user passwords (Aziz, column 2 lines 1-13).

18. With regards to claims 3 and 7, Thomlinson as modified teaches the one-time password being a unique user identifier and the one time password being transmitted out of band (Aziz, column 2 lines 45-60).

19. With regards to claims 4 and 8, Thomlinson as modified teaches a second key being required in an algorithm that generates a session key used to decrypt data (Thomlinson, column 10 lines 11-16).

20. Claims 2, 5-6, 13, 16, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomlinson et al US Patent No. 6,389,535 and Aziz US Patent No. 5,604,803, as applied to claims 1, 12, and 15 above, and in further view of Mi et al US Patent No. 6,418,472.

21. With regards to claims 2 and 6, Thomlinson as modified fails to teach the step of transmitting the identity of the client machine to the content provider. Mi teaches the step of transmitting the identity of the client machine to the content provider to

authenticate that the user is using the client machine thereby permitted data to be accessed only on the client machine (Mi, column 8 lines 32-46). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Mi's method of transmitting a client's identity with Thomlinson as modified because it offers the advantage of allowing the identification of a platform or device employed by the user prior to granting access to an object (Mi, column 1 line 69 – column 2 line 2).

22. With regards to claims 5, 13 and 16, Thomlinson as modified teaches everything described above and the use of a separate user supplied password (Thomlinson, column 10 lines 5-9), but fails to teach the user accessing a web page of said content provider, downloading an applet from said content provider to said client machine. Mi teaches the user accessing a web page of said content provider, downloading an applet from said content provider to said client machine (Mi, column 5 lines 4-21, column 6 lines 15-67). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Mi's applet procedure with Thomlinson as modified because it offers the advantage of providing a tamper resistant user friendly method of authentication that helps identify a user (Mi, column 1 line 61 – column 2 line 5).

23. With regards to claims 18-19, Thomlinson as modified teaches authenticating the user to said content provider based on said stored mapping (Mi, column 4 lines 45-52, column 5 lines 43-60), generating a new encryption key based on said second key (Thomlinson, column 9 lines 20-22, master key), encrypting a new encryption key based

on said second key (Thomlinson, column 9 lines 20-22, item key encrypted by master key), encrypting said additional data with said new encryption key (Thomlinson, column 9 lines 13-19), and transmitting said encrypted additional data to said client machine whereat the new encryption key is decrypted using said second key and said encrypted additional data is decrypted using said new encryption key (Thomlinson, column 10 lines 15-16).

24. Claims 9, 14, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomlinson et al US Patent No. 6,389 in view of Aziz US Patent No. 5,604,803, and Jablon US Patent No. 6,226,383. Jablon describes cryptographic methods for remote authentication.

25. With regards to claims 9, 14, and 17, Thomlinson teaches the generating of a first key (Thomlinson, column 9 lines 20-22, master key), the encrypting of a second key using the first key and an encryption algorithm (Thomlinson, column 9 lines 20-22, item key encrypted by master key), decrypting the second key using the first key when the user desires access to data (Thomlinson, column 10 lines 5-13, decrypt item key using master key), the storing of an encrypted second key on the client machine (Thomlinson, column 9 line 63 – column 10 line 4), and accessing the data using the second key (Thomlinson, column 10 lines 15-16). Thomlinson lacks a reference to the use of a one-time password, the sending of g^a to the client machine, generating g^b , encrypting g^b , and calculating $g^{(a*b)}$ as part of the authentication procedure. Aziz teaches the use of a one-time password (Aziz, column 6 lines 61-64). Jablon teaches a procedure

called Hidden-Password Validation that includes the sending of g^a to the client machine (Jablon, column 7 lines 16-23), generating g^b (Jablon, column 7 lines 23-26), encrypting g^b (Jablon, column 7 lines 23-26 g^b is exchanged using Diffie-Hellman encryption), and calculating $g^{(a*b)}$ (Jablon, column 7 lines 25-27) as part of the authentication procedure. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Aziz's method of using one-time passwords and Jablon's exchange procedures with Thomlinson's system because it would offer the advantage of reducing the likelihood of an unauthorized user gaining access to user passwords (Aziz, column 2 lines 1-13) and because it would help reduce the vulnerability of the password if a host computer's password database is exposed (Jablon, column 20 lines 17-20).

26. Claims 10 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomlinson et al US Patent No. 6,389,535, Aziz US Patent No. 5,604,803, and Jablon US Patent No. 6,226,383, as applied to claim 9 above, and in further view of Mi et al US Patent No. 6,418,472.

27. With regards to claim 10, Thomlinson as modified fails to teach the step of transmitting the identity of the client machine to the content provider. Mi teaches the step of transmitting the identity of the client machine to the content provider to authenticate that the user is using the client machine thereby permitting data to be accessed only on the client machine (Mi, column 8 lines 32-46). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to

utilize Mi's method of transmitting a client's identity with Thomlinson as modified because it offers the advantage of allowing the identification of a platform or device employed by the user prior to granting access to an object (Mi, column 1 line 69 – column 2 line 2).

28. With regards to claim 20, Thomlinson as modified teaches authenticating the user to said content provider based on said stored mapping (Mi, column 4 lines 45-52, column 5 lines 43-60), generating a new encryption key based on said second key. (Thomlinson, column 9 lines 20-22, master key), encrypting a new encryption key based on said second key (Thomlinson, column 9 lines 20-22, item key encrypted by master key), encrypting said additional data with said new encryption key (Thomlinson, column 9 lines 13-19), and transmitting said encrypted additional data to said client machine whereat the new encryption key is decrypted using said second key and said encrypted additional data is decrypted using said new encryption key (Thomlinson, column 10 lines 15-16).

29. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Thomlinson et al US Patent No. 6,389,535, Aziz US Patent No. 5,604,803, and Jablon US Patent No. 6,226,383 as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Schneier Applied Cryptography.

30. With regards to claim 11, Thomlinson as modified, lacks a reference to a MAC authentication procedure. Schneier describes the one-way hash function termed a

MAC that is used to verify authenticity (Page 455, Section 18.14). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Schneier's MAC authentication on g^{a+b} to authenticate the server to the client because it provides a verification method that is reliant on having the same key. Both client and server generate the same key during the authentication procedure so the MAC authentication would be an easy way to check authenticity without needing security since it is a one-way function (Page 455, Section 18.14).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

31. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew L. Nalven whose telephone number is 571 272 3839. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8-6, Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jacques Louis-Jacques can be reached on 571 272 6962. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system; see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Andrew Nalven

AN

Jacques Louis-Jacques
JOSEPH A. LOUIS-JACQUES
FACSIMILE COMMUNICATOR